



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE JANUARY 3, 2006

Minutes

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee
met
at 6:00p.m. on January 3, 2006 in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

Members present were: Jerry Chomanczuk, Wayne Haney, Mark Rattermann, Steve Stromquist, and Madeleine Torres, thereby establishing a quorum.

Christine Barton-Holmes, Matt Griffin, and David Littlejohn attended the Committee meeting on behalf of the Department of Community Services; John Molitor, Legal Counsel, was also in attendance.

Department Announcements: Matt Griffin noted that Item 8, Docket Number 05080023 ADLS Amend: Two Parkwood-Firestone Signage, and also Item 4, Docket Number 05110024 ADLS Amend: Meridian North Medical-Signage would be continued and heard at the February 7, 2006 Committee meeting.

Jerry Chomanczuk noted that every January the Plan Commission has a reassignment of the roles of the Committees. He asked Committee members that, when this reassignment takes place later in the month, that two or three of the current Committee members take an active role in the items that may get continued to the next meeting. He said that would provide continuity going forward.

The Special Studies Committee considered the following items:

1. Docket No. 05050003 Z: Fortune Rezone

The applicant seeks to rezone 43.6 acres from S1 to PUD for the purpose of developing a site with single family homes, townhomes, and limited commercial uses. The site is located at 2555 W 131st Street and is zoned S1.

Filed by Charlie Frankenberger

Charlie Frankenberger said that he represents Indiana Land Development in the request for a zoning change. He noted that Paul Shoopman was also in attendance on behalf of Indiana Land Development and that the current owners of the subject real estate were also in attendance.

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Charlie Frankenberger pointed out that the issue was last reviewed by the Special Studies committee in September. He noted that in that meeting as well as numerous other meetings with remonstrators, Paul Shoopman received input. Charlie Frankenberger introduced the proposed project and surrounding area and, then, highlighted the four significant revisions to the plan since the last Committee meeting. He said that the revisions include an enhanced buffer along the Western boundary of the real estate adjacent to the Young parcel, the relocation of the North & South road along the Southern boundary to the East at the request of the property owners to the South so it did not line up directly with their home, significant and increased tree preservation, as well as the addition of an amenity area. He noted that there were also numerous architectural enhancements that had been made including mandatory landscaping, roof pitch minimums, designer grade entry doors, window grills, the elimination of vinyl siding, and the requirement of twelve-inch overhangs. He said that it was Indiana Land Development's belief that the plan proposed last September provided reasonable transition from the high-intensity residential and commercial areas to the East. He said that to further address concerns additional revisions had been made. He noted that originally limited commercial uses were proposed. He said that those commercial uses had been eliminated and were no longer permitted anywhere in the proposed plan. He said that the proposal would be totally residential. He said that the density originally approved was 4.2 per acre and has now been reduced to 2.98 per acre. He said that the detached single-family residences and townhomes would be comparable in price, architecture, and square footage to the detached single-family residences and townhomes to be constructed to the immediate East of the parcel. He said that to provide internal transition in the site, the lot sizes on the Western boundary have been increased and he said that there would be commensurate increase in the sales prices of those homes. He said that the proposal would return to the Committee at the February 7, 2006 meeting.

Matt Griffin commented that the petitioner was proposing some of the changes that were requested by members of the Committee and the public. He said that at this point the Department doesn't have anything additional knowing that the petitioners will return next month with some important detail changes to what they are proposing.

Jerry Chomanczuk clarified that a vote was not expected at this meeting pending further information being provided by the petitioner in February.

Jerry Chomanczuk called for comments from the public.

Marilyn Anderson, who lives at 3884 Shelborne Court, commented that there are things that are much better about this plan. She said that she is glad that they removed the commercial and that the density has been reduced. She said that the land is currently zoned S-1, Low-Density residential. She noted that it is currently zoned for 1 unit per acre if the petitioners had an open space plan. She said that the proposed plan is nearly tripling the density that is allowed. She said that the plan is coming as a PUD for the purpose of increasing the density. She said that this really goes back to when the Village of West Clay got the approved changes. She said that the placement of the retention pond on the West side and some other things were very purposely done because this particular property was raised as an issue. She said that the neighbors were assured when the Village of West Clay changes were approved that would not affect this

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

particular parcel. She said it obviously has affected this parcel rather dramatically. She said that she is just reminding the Committee members that the neighbors were told that it wouldn't matter and that this is a very drastic change in the density.

Dee Fox, who resides at 11389 Royal Court, said that she agrees that some important changes have been made, but that density is still the issue. She said that with the Village of West Clay, the neighbors were given a lot of assurances that it would not be allowed to spread to surrounding properties. She said that she has heard at least twice that the Village of West Clay has lowered the property values of surrounding properties. She said that if that is the case and if it is perceived that way, then she doesn't see any reason to continue transitioning off of the Village of West Clay. She said that she would like to know what the minimum square footage of the proposed homes will be and also what the largest lot would be.

Terry Huff, of 2300 W. 136th Street, said that he is in favor of the Committee supporting this project and putting in the PUD for this particular property. Terry Huff thinks that the revisions have shown that it's going to cause a nice transition between high density commercial into more of an area with lower density S-1. He said that his area and the entire Towne Road corridor has been built up. As a resident there, he's accepted that, but he said that he wants the developer to build a quality development. He asked that the Committee look at the quality of the development. He said that the density is a non-issue, in his opinion, if the quality is there.

Charlie Frankenberger said that the suggestion that this PUD is somehow inappropriate or not authorized by the zoning ordinance is not correct. He said that the PUD is a permitted PUD under the City of Carmel's ordinance. Charlie Frankenberger said the apparently there was a statement made that referred to assurances made at the time this section of the Village of West Clay was approved that it wouldn't affect the Fortune parcel—Mr. Frankenberger was not aware of those assurances and does not think that the Plan Commission would make decisions about property that wasn't before them. He said that he did know that the landowner, Wendy Fortune, did not provide those assurances. Charlie Frankenberger said that to the best of his knowledge, there is no dislike of the Villages of West Clay—Mr. Frankenberger thinks the Village is a very fine development. He said that the density reality for the Fortunes is what is to their immediate east and that is 7.5 per acre and commercial development on the corner. He said that the Village of West Clay fills a specific niche in Clay Township, however, it is necessary to transition from that and the idea of transition is not a new concept—in many instances, transitioning is supported by the Comprehensive Plan. In its text, the Comprehensive Plan provides for low intensity residential areas and should be discouraged from being located adjacent to community employment areas. The Comprehensive Plan also says that high-density residential areas should be encouraged to occur along the edge of residential community areas adjacent to high or medium intensity commercial areas. He said that the Comprehensive Plan says that transitions in scale and density should occur between residential communities and community regional employment areas to facilitate maintenance of neighborhood stability. Mr. Frankenberger said he disagrees that the zoning is inappropriate—it is much lower than originally proposed and provides very reasonable transition.

Madeleine Torres asked what the number of units was on the original plan.

Charlie Frankenberger responded that he would have to look at the old packet. He said that he knew when they calculated the 4.2 units per acre that they calculated the density separately of the commercial area. He said that was what resulted in the 4.2 units per acre. He commented that now that the petitioners are going to be using the real estate that was allocated for commercial as residential he said that it lowered the density.

Mark Rattermann asked if there was any paper showing the improvements on the land. He said that he was interested in the design and what these homes are going to look like. He said that telling him what they are going to look like. He said that he is going to need to see the details—drawings and elevations that illustrate how the PUD will look. He said that he is also going to need to see minimum square footages on the detached single-family homes, and what the proposed market segment is.

Jerry Chomanczuk said he also needed more details. He asked for definition of what amenities would actually be part of the development. He asked for additional definition with regards to the fencing that will separate the Western boundary—behind the townhomes, along the retention pond. He commented that he likes what the petitioner has done with many of the concessions that have been made, particularly removing the commercial. He said that alleviated a lot of the questions and concerns. He said that he is not certain that the density comparisons are correct. He discussed density on the Village of West Clay. He asked for an “apples to apples” comparison.

Discussion ensued regarding the density equations and calculations.

Wayne Haney commented that the southern 40% of this development is very dense. He said that there must be about sixty units and there isn't any recreational space at all except for retention ponds. He said that he would like to see some tot lots or recreational areas to relieve the monotony.

Madeleine Torres commented that recently a plan came before the Committee where the petitioner proposed underground retention ponds, so that the land on top couldn't be built on, but could be used as open space. She said that she was wondering if that had been explored at all on this site as a means to opening up more space for recreation.

Steve Stromquist added that he would like to see pictures of the houses and look at what the architectural style is that is being proposed. He clarified the lot sizes that were proposed.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked the petitioner to bring examples to the next meeting of existing subdivisions and developments with lots that are around 50 by 130, so the committee can have a visual comparison that they can recognize.

Charlie Frankenberger said that he would check into that.

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Jerry Chomanczuk commended the petitioner on all the changes that have been made in the right direction. He said that the next hearing on this project would take place on February 7, 2006.

2. **Docket No. 05080008 ADLS Amend: KinderCare Learning Center Signage**

The applicant seeks approval for a new ground sign.

The site is located at 10616 Lakeshore Dr. and is zoned S-2.

Filed by Bill Hutchison for Hutchison Signs and Electric Co.

Bill Hutchison said that the petitioner had the existing five-foot by six-foot removed. He said that he met onsite with staff in regards to the new sign design and lighting layout for that sign. He passed around a sample of the building material he would be using. He said that instead of plastic faces, the petitioner had switched to a routed high-density urethane. He noted that it was similar to the sign on the corner of 106th and Keystone that King Church has. He said that the lighting would stay with the same ground light of the same color. He noted that it was a high-pressure sodium fixture. He said it would be the same square footage, 27 square feet, as what was submitted.

Mark Schmidl, regional facility manager from Knowledge Learning Corporation, parent company for KinderCare, said that he was here to address the landscaping and lighting, which is not up to the current code. He discussed specific species that they wanted to swap.

Matt Griffin noted that species change would need to be approved by the Urban Forester.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked the petitioner to propose to the Department what they think they would want to do. He said that a commitment from KinderCare to address the landscaping issues would be sufficient for Committee.

Mark Schmidl said that the next issue that they had was lighting. He presented detailed drawings of lighting fixtures to the Committee.

Fred Glaser commented that he thinks that the residents want “can lights” that are not real bright. Fred Glaser thought the petitioner committed to “can lights” in 1983.

Discussion ensued regarding lighting fixture types.

Jerry Chomanczuk said that the most important thing was that there was a commitment from the petitioner to replace the “offending” light. The Committee withheld decision as to the appropriate type of lighting pending more discussion and guidance from the Department.

Mark Schmidl said that the light was used for safety when parents pick up their children. He said that the vans had been parked on the Southwest corner of the parking lot. He said that they have been asked to move them to the Northwest corner of the parking lot. He said that they were looking for permission to park the vans there and that they were looking for what they had to do to be able to park the vans there.

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Matt Griffin said that the Department wants the petitioner to work with Scott Brewer in the Urban Forestry Department to establish an agreeable landscaping plan for replacing all of the missing shrubs. He said that the original approval showed the lights being sunk into the soffits and overhangs, so that one wouldn't see this out casting light. He said that he thinks one way to mitigate this is to get a fixture that casts the light directly onto the building. He said that the original approval specified a 75-watt bulb. He commented that he didn't really have a lot of input on the parking lot lighting until he had a definitive answer as to who was responsible for the pole. He said that there are ways that they can park the vans where they currently park them. He said it is all based upon signage. He said that the ordinance requires those signs to be of a certain size. He said that if the petitioner wants to take off the decal and put on a smaller decal, then they could be parked there. He said that it seems that there would be a feasible way for them to drop off the children at the door and repark the vehicles.

Jerry Chomanczuk called for comments from the public.

Steve Simmons, whose children attend KinderCare, said that safety is a huge issue and that the parking lot lighting must stay; there should be no negotiation on that. However, the appearance of the lighting leaves something to be desired. Mr. Simmons said that the van parking is much better on the southwest corner because they would be more of an obstruction pulling into the parking lot.

Kendria Ware, district manager for Knowledge Learning Corporation, said that she wanted to discuss the licensing and Board of Health regulations that KinderCare has to follow. She said that having the drop off point on the Northwest corner is more dangerous because there are no sidewalks and the children have to walk through the parking lot; it is dark and difficult to see at 7:00 AM. She said that KinderCare has a different set of licensing regulations than an elementary school. She said they couldn't drop children off unless there was another adult present that takes the children physically and walks them to the classroom. She said that children couldn't even walk to the bathroom unless an adult takes them. She said that if the children are dropped off at the door, the teacher would have to get out of the van, leaving it running, and walk them to the classroom. She said their vans have safety alarm buttons that sound an alarm if the vans are left running and unattended for too long. She requested dimensions of what would be permitted for their decals. She said that their concern is the safety of the children.

Jack Badger, who lives at 3039 Rolling Springs Drive, commended KinderCare for their efforts in removing the existing illegal sign. He said that the neighbors find that the buses are actually used to transfer children to the elementary schools, not kids who are actually enrolled in KinderCare, which he pointed out was the approved use. He said that he doesn't understand why the buses can't be parked where they are now on the North side. He said they could be parked on the Southwest to let the children out and then moved for storage purposes. He said that as far as parking lot lighting, he doesn't have a problem with parking lot lighting. He said that he has a problem with the fact that there was no approval from the City on it. He said that the school down the street has white wall down lighting and that the City has approved the school's parking lot lighting. He said that he commends KinderCare on their efforts to replace the landscaping. He said that driving along 106th street and looking at KinderCare, there are all kinds of plastic

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

toys that are all along that South wall that are offensive to a residential area. He asked why they were not stored away. He said that a spring-loaded hinge would work well to keep the outdoor storage doors closed. He noted that the door was open at 3:00p.m. that day. All the neighbors are asking is that KinderCare be a friendly, residential operation within the kind of area that is there. He said that he thought that the new proposed sign was very attractive.

Bob Mitchell, who resides on the 11000 block of Lakeshore Drive West in the Woodland Springs subdivision, said that he admittedly doesn't know the codes or what was approved in 1983. He said that he thinks that it is unfair to ask KinderCare to spend its resources on their facility when it is no more unsightly or out of place than the expansive elementary school across the street or the cemetery across the street, or the fire station across the street. He said that there is nothing about the KinderCare learning center that disrupts the sanctity, visual appeal, or security of the neighborhood. He said that he does believe that the Committee should put a lot of care and consideration when considering these issues because it would be a lot of money, work, and safety issues to simply appease the concerns of a minority of the neighborhood.

Sherrie Dodd spoke as a resident of Carmel whose daughter has been at KinderCare for almost three and a half years. Ms. Dodd said that the children are required by State law to play outside everyday as long as the temperature is above 27 degrees Fahrenheit and the kids need to have something to do. She said that the toys could be kept on the West side and the North side. Ms. Dodd agreed with previous comments regarding the parking of the vans and the parking lot lighting.

Theresa Mitchell also spoke as a Carmel resident whose children attend KinderCare at this location. Ms. Mitchell said that there was some confusion about the buses that Mr. Badger was talking about. She said that just because children start Kindergarten doesn't mean that the children are not getting daycare after school and before school. She said that kids do actually attend the KinderCare, go to school, and, then, come back. Ms. Mitchell said that KinderCare vans are not just providing for the children who go to the elementary school, but also for the children at the daycare.

Kendria Ware clarified that the children have to be enrolled to use the buses and that KinderCare is required by the state to have a certain number of toys.

Kathy Smart, a resident of Brookshire who has a two year old that attends KinderCare, said that she has done many daycares over the years. She said that the teachers are there to oversee the best interests of the children. She said that the teachers shouldn't have to waste their time trying to think about where to park the buses and where the toys are. She said that she would rather the teachers have time to developmentally give the children the skills that they need. She commented that the toys in KinderCare's yard are no more obtrusive than those sitting in people's backyards.

Jerry Chomanczuk commented that he felt that the neighbors were concerned with the exposure of the toys, not the toys themselves. He said that he felt that the storage of the toys was an issue and that could be easily addressed. Jerry Chomanczuk felt that the petitioner had addressed

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

landscaping. The issues with the van parking are that KinderCare vans have quite a bit of logo advertising on them. Jerry Chomancuk thought that if the advertising on the vans were to be “toned down” substantially, there would not be a major issue as to the placement of the vans. Jerry Chomanczuk said that he would tend to vote with the group who lives the day-to-day handling of the children to be aware of where the dangers are and to address those dangers in an appropriate manner. He said that dumpster screening could be addressed fairly easily. He suggested a timer be put on the lighting.

Mark Schmidl responded that he’s never asked about putting a timer up there before, but noted that the lights were provided by the utility company. He said he could do that with the building lighting pretty easily.

Jerry Chomanczuk said he thinks it is unfair to ask the petitioner to validate the lighting when the source of the lighting is unknown.

Matt Griffin asked Mark Schmidl if KinderCare was paying the utility bill for that lighting.

Mark Schmidl said that he doesn’t pay an electric bill, so he doesn’t know, but he said he could make some calls and find out.

Jerry Chomanczuk said that he would like the Department to help the Committee to define what the lighting should be on that property.

Wayne Haney suggested that all the petitioners had to do was to put up a wall box with a recessed lens then the light goes down and there would be little cost difference since the petitioner is going to replace the light fixtures anyway. He asked if the large pole on the corner could be moved, so KinderCare could put up some residential light poles for their parking giving them a better spread.

Mark Rattermann said that he was a little concerned about the fact that KinderCare made these commitments and then as time has gone on, they have forgotten those. He asked Matt Griffin if KinderCare legally had the right to have any sign there.

Matt Griffin responded that they did. He said that the sign was illegal because the sign had no permit and no ADLS approval through Committee.

Mark Rattermann said that he could see how the lights were put up. He commented that the adjacent property owners were not present at the meeting to remonstrate. He said that it irritates him that the commitments were overlooked, but he said that the parcel seems to be relatively isolated. He said that he doesn’t have a big problem with the lights other than the fact that commitments were broken.

Madeleine Torres asked the Committee to please move forward with this.

Discussion ensued regarding the verbiage of the motion.

Mark Rattermann clarified that the petition was for a ground sign. He noted that the other issues were enforcement issues. He asked if the Committee needed to vote on anything but the sign at this point.

John Molitor advised that the Committee could ask them for commitments to conformity on the other issues while the petitioner is here and before the Committee would grant approval on something else.

Madeleine Torres made formal motion to approve Docket Number 05080008 ADLS Amend: KinderCare Learning Center Signage conditioned upon the Department approval of the landscaping, building lighting, the van parking, the dumpster screening, as well as the parking lot lighting when that is worked out. The motion was seconded by Steve Stromquist and **Approved 5-0 subject to working with the Department of Community Services to resolve the various enforcement issues that are outstanding.**

3. **Docket No. 05110024 ADLS Amend: Game Room – Signage**

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall sign.

The site is located at 12345 Old Meridian St. and is zoned OM/O.

Filed by Brenda Owens for Sign Crafters, Inc.

The Docket number was continued to the February 7, 2006 meeting because the petitioner failed to appear.

4. **Docket No. 05110033 ADLS Amend: Meridian North Medical – Signage**

The applicant seeks approval for a new sign package

The site is located at 13590 - B North Meridian St and is zoned B-5.

Filed by Adam DeHart for Keeler-Webb Associates.

The Docket number was continued to the February 7, 2006 meeting at the request of the petitioner.

5. **Docket No. 05120011 ADLS Amend: Hamilton Crossing East - Rooftop Antenna**

The applicant seeks approval for a rooftop antenna and enclosure wall.

The site is located at 13085 Hamilton Crossing Blvd and is zoned B5/Business within the US 31 overlay.

Filed by Dave Dickson of Double Take, LLC for Cingular Wireless.

Dave Dickson, representing Cingular Wireless, and Lee Barker with GPE Associates appeared before the Committee.

Dave Dickson said that zoning ordinance for the City of Carmel requires that antennas be shielded from view on rooftops. He said that because of the current architecture of the building, Cingular would not meet that requirement. He said that the petitioner would like to construct a six-foot parapet wall on top of the penthouse of this five-story building. He said that the

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

antennas would be located behind the parapet wall. He said that the radio equipment would be located at the base of the North wall of the penthouse. He said that the wall and cabinets located along the penthouse wall would be painted to match the current colors of the building. He said that everything with the exception of the very top of the cabinets would not be seen at all. He passed around a sample of the building material of the wall. He said that the purpose of the material is so that radio waves travel through it. He said you couldn't use metal or anything like that because the waves would be deflected. He noted that the parapet wall would match the existing building colors.

Matt Griffin said that the Department feels that they are doing what is necessary to camouflage the equipment as specified by the ordinance and that they recommend approval.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked if the current penthouse housed any equipment.

Dave Dickson said that the existing penthouse housed a water-cooling tower.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked if the equipment served the people in the buildings or if they would be leasing the space from Duke.

Dave Dickson commented that the space on the roof would be rented, but that it would be for public emergency use.

Discussion ensued about the future technology of wireless communications.

Wayne Haney asked the petitioner if the square pattern was going to be duplicated on the screen wall.

Dave Dickson responded that it was not going to be one continuous wall form, but would be a series of panels.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked if there was any concern with regards to the height.

Matt Griffin said that if it got to a point where there were problems with height, then the interpretation of the ordinance would need to be rethought.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve **Docket number 05120011 ADLS Amend: Hamilton Crossing East**, seconded by Madeleine Torres and **APPROVED 5-0**.

6. **Docket No. 05100038: Clarian North Expansion**

The applicant seeks to create 1 medical office building, as an addition to the existing Clarian North facility, on 57.950 acres.

The site is located at 11700 North Meridian Street and is zoned PUD (US 31 Overlay District).

Filed by Joseph Scimia of Baker & Daniels for Clarian Health Partners, Inc.

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Roger Kilmer with Baker & Daniels, Adam Kaiser of Jacobs, and Dennis Veerkamp with Biagi Engineers appeared before the Committee representing the petitioner.

Roger Kilmer stated that the petitioner is proposing to add second medical office building with 133,000 square feet, five stories in height with an additional screen wall for equipment up on top. He said that the project has been reviewed by TAC and was presented to the Plan Commission on December 20, 2005. He said that there were three items that needed to be addressed. He noted that they had been in contact with Scott Brewer, DOCS Urban Forester, but that they had not yet received a detailed comment list from him. He said that the second item they needed to address was path connectivity. He said that the Department had mentioned three places that they wanted to see better connectivity on their recreation path. He said that the petitioner doesn't feel that those connections should go in because they feel that they do not lead or focus people towards the building. He said that there is a dense hedgerow around the parking area, which would block visibility of the path from the parking lot anyway. He said that the petitioner does not feel it would be of any benefit to put the paths in. He said that the final item to discuss was that the petitioner would bring resolution to any outstanding engineering issues. He said that the main engineering concern is providing certain drawings and the drainage study. He noted that those have been provided and that he would follow up with them tomorrow to make sure that Engineering had everything that they needed.

Christine Barton-Holmes commented that the recommendations for connectivity were based upon observation of the logical shortcuts of the sites. She said that people were not just going to be coming to the building, but that they would also be leaving the building and that if a walkway were provided walking to the perimeter path would be facilitated by it. Other than that, the remaining issues lie with other Departments or have been resolved, so staff is suggesting the project be sent back to full Plan Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Madeleine Torres said that she was unclear on the process. She commented that there was a public hearing on December 20, 2005. She noted that this wasn't a change to their PUD, so she was curious as to why they were seeing it again.

Matt Griffin said that in the PUD approval, they had seen the footprints of the buildings, but not the actual buildings themselves. He said that as the buildings go up, the Committee would be reviewing the building elevations and architecture.

Jerry Chomanczuk clarified that this building was part of the master plan and original PUD.

Mark Rattermann said that he wanted to talk about the multi-use paths.

Discussion ensued regarding the destinations and different routes of the path system.

Roger Kilmer clarified that there was a path along Illinois that is in the right-of-way that would continue North as Illinois Street is extended North.

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Mark Rattermann said that he was concerned about transitions. He said as long as that accommodation is made, then he doesn't care if there is one access or three places.

Matt Griffin suggested the petitioner stub the path into the future multi-use path to be built as Illinois Street expands.

Roger Kilmer stated that the petitioner would commit to doing that. He said that when Illinois Street extends North, the petitioners would gladly do connect o the multi-use path.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked if the lighting in the new parking area would match the intensity of the parking lot lighting in the existing parking lot.

Roger Kilmer said that they would be using the same fixtures and the same height.

Mark Rattermann clarified that there was nothing West of Illinois Street on this proposal at all.

Roger Kilmer said that the petitioner is adding the address to some of the signage, as was requested at the Plan Commission meeting.

Steve Stromquist made formal motion to return Docket 05100038: Clarian North Expansion to the full Plan Commission with a **favorable recommendation**, seconded by Mark Rattermann and approved 5-0.

7. **Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Place**

The applicant seeks to create 129 townhomes on 12 acres.

The site is located at 12852 Old Meridian Street and is zoned OM/SFA.

Filed by Jon Isaacs for Centex Homes.

Jon Isaacs with Centex Homes appeared before the Committee.

Jon Isaacs said that they did not get the Committee a packet after the Plan Commission meeting on December 20, 2005. He said that after the last meeting, Centex felt that they had a number of outstanding issues that they needed to address prior to coming back in. He said that the largest outstanding issue at this point is really defining what Centex intends the project to be. He said that Centex Homes is interested in building the residential portion of the development. He said that Centex is looking for a business partner to enter into an agreement with them to take on the mixed-use portion of the development along Old Meridian. He said that Centex Homes took a stab at the architecture of all of the buildings. He said that after discussion with Staff, Centex Homes revised their site plans based upon what was addressed at Plan Commission last month. He noted that the changes were relocating the parking from the front of the buildings along Old Meridian to the back of the buildings, and condo buildings in the back and mixed use buildings up front. He said that in the next few months Centex Homes hopes to have the business partner step forward and to bring their own architecture. He said that if that does not come to fruition, what Centex would like to do, is move forward with a development plan approval for the road network, as well as the residential portion that Centex is going to build, and then, come in for an

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

ADLS approval on the individual buildings when Centex knows what is going to be built. He said that Centex, obviously, needs to address the parking and drainage issues and the road network. He said that Centex would like to request a continuance until next month. He said that hopefully, Centex would be able to come back with answers to the questions that are still outstanding. He said that there is a question with a planned road cut in Old Meridian and whether it can be moved to meet up with the entrance going into this Development. He said that Centex is waiting on information from the City's road consultant to know if that can be done or not. He noted that the detention facilities would be underground. He noted that Centex had filed for the Rezone on one of the parcels. He said that he would be happy to entertain any questions that the Committee members might have.

Matt Griffin clarified that Centex would be coming forward with the road network; even if no business partner was solidified.

Jon Isaacs said that from a master-planning standpoint, he thought that Centex would go as far as to establish everything down to the building pad. He said that he hopes to establish a parking plan that would lock in the sizes of the multi-use buildings.

Matt Griffin said that because of the state of flux of the project, he really didn't have anything of substance to base his comments on.

Discussion ensued about the potential uses of the mixed-use buildings.

Mark Rattermann asked if the parking shown on the plans meets the new ordinance.

Jon Isaacs said that he believes it does.

Discussion ensued about the parking sizes and types.

Mark Rattermann asked if the v-shaped building was a clubhouse.

Jon Isaacs said there would probably be 10,000 square feet of space of recreation space. He said that the other half of the first story of that building would be covered parking for the one to two stories of residential above.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked if the buildings along Old Meridian would become townhomes if Centex was unable to secure a partner.

Jon Isaacs responded that he was confident that they would get a partner.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked that the petitioner show the future roundabouts on the next plan, so he could see the access to the site.

Discussion ensued about the underground detention.

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Wayne Haney commented that he liked the architecture on buildings 1,4a&b, and 5 are fine. He said that it was superior to buildings 2 and 3.

Jerry Chomanczuk said that the item would be **continued until February 7, 2006** or the next date that additional details would be available.

8. **Docket No. 05080023 ADLS Amend: Two Parkwood - Firestone Signage – CONTINUED TO FEB 7.**

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall sign.

The site is located at 310 E 96th St. is zoned B-6.

Filed by Steve Granner for Bose McKinney & Evans LLP.

The petitioner requested a continuance to the Feb. 7, 2006 meeting.

9. **Docket No. 05120022 ADLS Amend: Chase (Michigan Rd.)- Signage**

The applicant seeks approval for at two new signs.

The site is located at 10495 Michigan Rd. zoned B-3.

Filed by Ken Cooley for Burkhardt Advertising.

Ken Cooley with Burkhardt Advertising representing Chase Bank appeared before the Committee.

Ken Cooley said that the petitioner is in the middle of the rebranding the former Bank One into the Chase Bank. He said that they would like to rebrand the West elevation and the North elevation of the building that had Bank One on them to say Chase Bank in 24-inch channel letters. He said that the letters are interior illuminated channel letter sets. He said that they are flat, plastic, and acrylic. He said that there are no signs on the bank itself. He said that his petition is for 27 square feet on each elevation.

David Littlejohn, DOCS, commented that the petitioners took down two signs and were requesting two signs and that the signs they were requesting were smaller than the ones they took down. He said that the Department was recommending approval of this petition.

Matt Griffin asked if the returns on the Bank One signs were also blue.

Ken Cooley responded that they were blue also.

Discussion ensued regarding the picture of the proposed signage included in the packets.

Ken Cooley noted that the sign would be centered and that the picture was not to scale and not representative of the actual placement of the sign.

Jerry Chomanczuk asked if the drive-thru signage was also.

January 3, 2006

Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Ken Cooley said that the land designator signage was also before the Committee. He said that the petitioners just want to put new lane designators up.

Jerry Chomanczuk said that he saw in the packet that one would say business.

Ken Cooley said that there would be a drive-thru lane designated to businesses, two drive-thru lanes, and an ATM lane.

Madeleine Torres made formal motion to approve docket number 05120022 ADLS Amend: Chase (Michigan Road) signage.

Wayne Haney seconded the motion.

Motion was **approved** 5-0.

10. **Docket No. 05110026 ADLS Amend: Law Office of Meunier & Marshall - Signage**

The applicant seeks approval for at one new sign.

The site is located at 320 S Range Line Rd. within the Carmel Dr. - Range Line Rd.

Overlay and is zoned B-1.

Filed by Sheila Marshall for the Law Office of Meunier & Marshall.

Jeff Meunier appeared before the Committee.

Jeff Meunier said that he had purchased and renovated the old Weiss & Company building on 320 South Rangeline. He said that they were before the Committee requesting approval of the sign permit for the signage for their law office. He passed around a sample of the color scheme for the building and the sign. He noted that they originally wanted a ground sign until they determined that they were in the Carmel Drive-Rangeline Road overlay zone. He said that they are proposing the wall sign.

Matt Griffin said that as proposed the sign complies with the ordinance and that the Department was recommending approval.

Steve Stromquist clarified what the color of the sign would be.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve **Docket number 05110026 ADLS Amend, Law Office of Meunier and Marshall signage**, seconded by Madeleine Torres, approved 5-0.

Wayne Haney made formal motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Madeleine Torres—
Meeting adjourned at 8:17 PM.

Special Studies Committee Chair - Jerry Chomanczuk

January 3, 2006
Carmel Plan Commission Special Studies Committee Minutes

Laura Rouse-DeVore, acting Secretary